

# Minutes

# City of Loma Linda

*Department of Community Development*

## Planning Commission

Chair Rosenbaum called an Adjourned Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:09 p.m., **Wednesday, January 12, 2005**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

**Commissioners Present:** Mary Lee Rosenbaum, Chair  
Randy Neff, Vice Chair  
Michael Christianson  
Charles Umeda  
Rene Sakala

**Commissioners Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** Richard Holdaway, City Attorney  
Deborah Woldruff, Community Development Director  
Cathy Johnson, Senior Planner  
Raul Colunga, Assistant Planner  
Jeff Peterson, Associate Engineer, Public Works Dept.  
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

### **ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED**

Director Woldruff explained that Item 2, a Request to declare 11354 Loma Vista Drive a Public Nuisance would have to be re-advertised because the wrong address was placed on the agenda. She also requested to change the order of the items on the agenda to address the Extension of Time request for Conditional Use Permit (CUP) No. 02-04 before Item E.1 - General Plan Amendment (GPA) NOS. 02-02 and 02-05, Zone Change (ZC) NOS. 02-02 and 02 05, Specific Plan (SP) NOS. 02-08 and 02-13 (University Village and Orchard Park). Chair Rosenbaum had no objections to the substitution.

### **ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

There were no oral reports.

### **NEW ITEMS**

#### **PUBLIC HEARING**

### **PC-05-01 - EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP) No. 02-04/PARCEL MAP (PM) No. 02-02 (PM No. 15944)**

Assistant Planner Colunga presented a brief staff report stating that the item for review was a request for a one-year extension of time for Conditional Use Permit (CUP) No. 02-04 and Parcel Map (PM) No. 02-02 in order to construct a 15,000 square foot drugstore building and ancillary 5,400 square foot building located at the northeast corner of Mt. View Avenue and Redlands Boulevard.

He continued to say that the applicant was Larry Lake who represented the Lake Development Group from Newport Beach. Mr. Colunga explained that originally Sav-on Drugstores was attached to the project but later withdrew. Consequently, the applicant was working to secure CVS Drugstores as the tenant for the entitled space. He added that the request would allow the developer time to secure the new tenant.

Mr. Colunga stated that the Conditions of Approval from the City Council meeting of November 12, 2002 allowed for up to three time extensions not to exceed 12 months each and that the findings for the CUP and PM were still valid from the October 2, 2002 Planning Commission meeting. He added that no verbal or written comments had been provided to staff.

The Public Comment period was opened at 7:14 p.m.

Jeanette (Golly) Gilbert, 25636 Sun Avenue, Loma Linda addressed the Commission asking if a Sav-on Pharmacy was still being considered and if so what would it mean in regards to traffic for Sun Avenue and what type of protection would there be from cars, parking and lighting. Director Woldruff replied that the same Conditions of Approval and plans approved at the earlier Planning Commission meeting would be in effect for any tenant. She added that the original plan was to have a left turn lane into the parking lot with a right turn lane out of the parking lot.

The Public Comment period was closed at 7:16 p.m.

Commissioner Christianson inquired if the staff of the business would be trained for the sale of liquor. The applicant, Mr. Larry Lake, replied that they would not request the approval of other types of liquor other than beer and wine as previously approved and that they currently provide training for staff. He added that they would not ask for changes to the approved Conditions of Approval.

Director Woldruff asked Mr. Lake if CVS had its own corporate architecture. Mr. Lake replied that the pharmacy had seen the approved plans and would follow the direction of the Planning Commission and of staff in regards to the architecture.

**Motion by Neff, seconded by Christianson, and unanimously carried to approve the request for an Extension of Time for Conditional Use Permit (CUP) NO. 02-04/Parcel Map (PM) NO. 02-02 (PM NO. 15944) based on the finding and subject to the Conditions of Approval.**

**PC-05-02 - REQUEST TO DECLARE 11354 LOMA VISTA DRIVE A PUBLIC NUISANCE AND THAT NOTICE TO ABATE IS ISSUED**

Director Woldruff reiterated that this item, the Request to declare 11354 Loma Vista Drive a Public Nuisance would have to be re-advertised because the wrong address was placed on the agenda.

**PC-05-03 - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA) NOS. 02-02 AND 02-05, ZONE CHANGE (ZC) NOS. 02-02 AND 02 05, SPECIFIC PLAN (SP) NOS. 02-08 AND 02-13 (UNIVERSITY VILLAGE AND ORCHARD PARK)**

Senior Planner Johnson gave a brief staff report. She explained that the item was first addressed at the December 15, 2004 meeting and was continued at that time to January 12, 2005. Ms. Johnson reported that she had researched the formal definitions of the terms "rural, urban, and historic" as requested by the Commission using several sources and found that there were various definitions for them, some quantitative and some qualitative, and still others were definitive.

Ms. Johnson quoted the dictionary definition of "urban" as "relating to, characteristic of, or constituting a city, and that the Census Bureau defined it as "any area with an overall population density of 500 people per square mile."

Ms. Johnson continued to say that the Census Bureau loosely defined the word rural, as being "anything that was outside of a metropolitan area was considered rural" and as being "relating to the country, country people or agriculture". The San Bernardino Code had an actual rural living designation, which had a list of 10 criteria and pertained to things as specific as soil type, agricultural lands, or mining.

She found that the definition of "historic" was more or less the same types of definition "as something that was of significance 50 years or older", which in some cases didn't necessarily make buildings or resources historical in nature. She concluded that she found that the definitions were more descriptive rather than quantitative or qualitative.

Ms. Johnson explained that in reviewing the project, she found that there were various descriptions that seemed appropriate such as the definition of "rural" as "a place that evokes the feeling of a small town with neighborhoods of simple yet of charming calm..." She remarked that with the word "rural", it represented more of a mood, an ambiance that would provide the charm, the benefits and the feeling of rural with all the modern conveniences. She continued to say that the words urban and historic tied in with that mood and would take the positive elements of each of the terms.

Chair Rosenbaum invited Lewis Operating Corp. to continue their presentation.

Mr. Gil Prestwood, Lewis Operating Corp. recapped his presentation of December 15, 2005 to address some of the concerns of the Planning Commission highlighted during the subsequent discussion. He continued stating that they had increased the commercial and retail portions on Redland Boulevard and that, at the Planning Commission's request Lewis Operating Corp. had adjusted the size of the lots and the parks on Mission Road. He added that increasing the size of the central park would place a greater burden on the homeowners because the increased cost would be reflected in the Homeowners' Association fees.

Mr. Prestwood commented that various other open spaces would be maintained by the HOA and accessible to all residents of other areas of the City via the trails leading into the parks. He continued to discuss the school site stating that they had been in extensive discussions with the Redlands Unified School District and they were quite positive about getting a school site in the project. Director Woldruff concurred with Mr. Prestwood.

He addressed questions of the Zanja Trails and the trail system stating that there would be additional monumentation to reflect on the history of the trail, including a display in Heritage Park where the Zanja would be exposed to show visitors what it was like hundred years ago.

He continued to speak to the issue of the apartments being placed next to the school site. He explained that the apartments at Homecoming would be luxury apartments and lifestyle for people who didn't wish to own a house.

Mr. Prestwood commented on the issue of lot sizes, stating that this project didn't lend itself to custom lot sizes, but their plans were to create neighborhoods with certain lot sizes, (i.e. 6,300 square feet). Commissioners Sakala and Rosenbaum commented that they felt that varying lot sizes would give the project interest and added that they were not asking the applicant to provide custom homes but different placement of the house on the lots. There was a lengthy discussion regarding lot sizes where Mr. Prestwood explained that builders used standardized lot sizes to create a product that was efficient to build. Commissioner Christianson reminded Mr. Prestwood that the Commission had indicated that they wanted larger lot sizes starting out at 100 feet of frontage for Mission Road and gradually reducing the lots towards the north.

Mr. Prestwood commented on the definition of "rural, urban and historic" and pointed out that the definition was included in the Historic Mission Overlay District. He added that they had developed the project using what was occurring on the south side of Mission Road, such as the treatment of the trails and the larger adjacent lots. He continued to say that they had increased the size of the lots north of Mission Road to create a better transition going north towards Redlands Boulevard.

Director Woldruff asked if the Planning Commission could conclude their discussion on the University Village Specific Plan to give equal opportunity for the applicants for the Orchard Park project to make their presentation.

Commission Umeda commented regarding issues of an increased buffer zone or green belt along Mission Road to break up a large mass of rooftops that could be seen from Barton Road. He also commented that he thought that a relationship existed between the density of a project and architectural design and added that the type of project that was approved on the south side of Mission Road should be avoided on the north side. He stated that this was the reason for the request of larger lot sizes and commented that he would have to like to see a package of architecture and design for the different neighborhoods.

Mr. Prestwood replied that the architecture and design guidelines were scheduled to be presented at the next Planning Commission meeting.

There was further discussion on lot sizes for a variety of the streetscapes and for a rural feel, and how they relate to the planned community type of development.

Other topics were discussed and the Commissioners had the following comments.

- Central Park – Increase size to provide space for a cultural gathering place for the community such as an amphitheater similar to the Redlands Bowl. - Director Woldruff pointed out that the city did not have the funds to purchase and maintain additional parks. That is why prospective applicants were required to plan for park space in their proposal;

- Size of the park – Commissioner Christianson commented that he would like to recommend to City Council that the applicant be required to exceed what he was proposing for the size of the park - Director Woldruff commented that as the project already exceeded the State requirement, it was not possible to require more. City Attorney Holdaway concurred stating that there were limitations as to what the City may insist that a developer provide.
- Community gardens – Recommendation to include them in the final plans and how this could be accomplished - Director Woldruff explained that a general statement could be added and included in the Specific Plan relative to gardens but not for a specific location in the project;
- Lot sizes – Commissioner Sakala asked to have varying lot sizes throughout the proposed projects and neighborhoods. Commissioner Neff commented that because of the geometry of the area, a variation of lot sizes might occur naturally;
- Apartment Complex - Not next to school grounds because of traffic and circulation issues as well as other types of constant activity around multi-family dwellings posing a threat to the children;

Chair Rosenbaum summarized the issues that were discussed in regards to the University Village project. She added that these were in addition to the items discussed at the December 15, 2004 meeting:

- More rural feel along Mission Road with larger lots, deeper into the project;
- Larger central park for amenities i.e. to accommodate cultural events;
- No apartments adjacent to the school;
- Good design and architecture.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to provide Mr. Prestwood the opportunity to conclude his presentation and receive comments from the Commissioners before proceeding with the presentation and discussion of the Orchard Park project.

Mr. Prestwood stated that he could bring back design guidelines and plot plans to the January 26, 2005 meeting.

Chair Rosenbaum listed the main topics that University Village would cover at the January 26, 2005 meeting:

- Design
- Architecture
- Lot layouts
- Landscaping

Chair Rosenbaum asked the representative of the Orchard Park project to make their presentation.

Mr. Richard Kunihiro, 26433 Margarita Lane, Loma Linda addressed the Commission and stated that he appreciated the opportunity to work with them to create quality living for Loma Linda with Orchard Park. He commented on the vision that was at the foundation of the project and their goals to build and maintain a quality and diverse housing product.

Mr. Kunihiro stated that their team consisted of Mr. Rick Stevens of AEI-CASC, Clyde Holland and Tom Warren of Holland Partners who were chosen for their extensive experience in developing some of the highest quality mixed-use communities, and KTG Architects.

Rick Stevens, AEI-CASC, 937 S. Via Lata, Ste 500, Colton addressed the Commission and stated that they had been listening to the comments and were rethinking their plan and provided some of the changes that they were considering.

- Planning Area 12 – The Japanese SDA Church was interested in the site and in negotiations with the Kunihiro family to purchase the property;
- Parks – They would occupy 10 acres of the project area (exceeds the requirement). Integration of several smaller parks to serve the various neighborhoods;
- Mixed-use – If there is residential incorporated in the planning area, it would have its separate recreation area;

- Transition from low-density uses to higher densities, i.e. the high-density commercial use transitioning southward from multi-family, to single-family and further south some type of heritage corridor along Mission Road;
- Trees – Preservation of trees required the design of a signalized intersection at Redlands Boulevard;
- Quality Design – Early in the project, they teamed up with KTG Architects and Holland Partners who will provide a very high quality product.

Tom Warren of the Holland Partners stated that they would provide some background on their firm and information that the Planning Commissioners could read through to familiarize themselves with the features that could be integrated in developing Orchard Park project. He introduced his partner, Mr. Clyde Holland.

Mr. Holland thanked the Planning Commission and staff for working with them on this project. He stated that the passion that the Planning Commission brought to the process was something they really appreciated. He commented that they would make a brief presentation to get consensus on the concepts that would allow them to design a suitable and acceptable project. He added that they would be ready to present their complete project on February 16, 2005, with a concept for each area that would include the architecture and that would integrate the complete project.

Mr. Holland commented on the following topics:

- The increase from the approximately 20,000 residents to a daytime population of close to 60,000 during the work week;
- Traffic and circulation concerns during the day from the out of town workforce;
- The target customer – How to meet the needs of the new residents and make the project a quality addition to the present community;
- Commercial development on California Street and Redlands Boulevard as the best location for commercial because of the I-10 corridor and the confluence of those two streets;
- Mixed-use on California Street appropriate to place the highest concentration of uses other than residential, i.e. Medical offices;
- Transition from highest density multi-family from Redlands Boulevard south to Mission Road;
- Mission Road dedicated for park space, trails, and historical and more rural uses.

Mr. Holland continued to describe the more specific product.

- Provide the higher density portions of the project with quality and diversity of product - One of their objectives was to address historic housing with diverse architectural designs;
- Provide quality amenities such as parks along Mission Road and a school area in Planning Area 11;
- Provide walking trails through neighborhoods to the central or other community parks, or to areas of mixed-use;
- Presence of the church with its own recreation activities;
- Other walking trails through Planning Areas 8, 9 and 10 with houses facing the parks and the school.

Mr. Holland explained that they were working towards a community with lots of character by the use of authentic historic housing such as Craftsman and Colonial styles and provided examples of these proposed products. He added that they were planning a live/work area in an urban mixed-use setting such as restaurants with residents above or rooftop gardens.

At 10:00 p.m., Commissioner Christianson asked Chair Rosenbaum for permission to leave the meeting. Mr. Holland gave Commissioner Christianson an opportunity to provide a brief comment on the direction the applicants were taking for the project. Mr. Christianson stated that the attention to details seemed promising.

Mr. Holland solicited comments from the Planning Commission regarding the density transition and any other suggestions that they would like the applicant to respond to during their project planning.

Commissioner Umeda commented that the entire presentation gave a feel of design and planning for the multi-family and residential and work/live products. He added that they seem to be on the right track and was looking forward to seeing more details regarding the parks.

Mr. Holland replied that he would provide examples of architectural design of projects they had completed. Commissioner Umeda also commented on the four-sided architecture and stated that he was encouraged by what he saw.

Commissioner Sakala stated her concerns centered on multi-family and single-family residences and their effects on commuting. Mr. Holland restated that he would provide pictures of the product at a later meeting and that the solution for a good fit with the existing community was to create a project that could include job share and ride share.

Commissioner Neff asked Mr. Holland if he thought he could really address the issue of traffic by providing enough housing. Mr. Holland replied that adding quality housing that would improve the community and provide housing closer to people's jobs.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the public comment period on Orchard Park project at 10:19 p.m.

David Warner, 11469 Campus Street, Loma Linda commented that in his opinion a transit system that was both reliable and frequent was very important. He also commented on pride in the community and a vision as two major concerns that needed to be considered. He stated that the project seemed to be on an excellent road and seemed to have a vision for the future.

Ric Revel, 13466 Mead Court, Loma Linda commented that he liked the European style of design, and the parks. He suggested that they look at better transportation for veterans and the disabled and consider an area for event venues such as a amphitheater.

Dick Wiley, 10848 Pepper Way, Loma Linda stated that he liked the concepts that were presented, but had concerns regarding traffic.

Georgia Hodgkin, 24360 Lawton Avenue, Loma Linda commented on the following topics:

- Good discussion on the Historic Mission Overlay District and suggested getting the definition for "rural" in that document;
- The addition of 3,028 houses was not appropriate;
- SCAG projected 4,000 dwelling units by the year 2020, therefore development could be stopped at this time;
- Loma Linda may be job rich, but salaries were lower because the Loma Linda University Medical Center staff were remunerated based on missionary wages;
- Her concern about traffic was for city streets and not the freeway;
- Homes for your families were not an issue in the City of Loma Linda.

Mr. Holland explained that they were planning for a transit node with bus transportation within their project. He continued to say that they would establish a vision then choose a builder that would share that vision.

Commissioner Neff asked that if the City would be amenable to discussion if an offer of transportation through these projects would be suggested. Director Woldruff stated that Omnitrans was willing to work with the City of Loma Linda. She added that the Planning Commission could make provisions for a transit center in the specific plans.

The project presentations were concluded at 10:55 p.m.

There was a brief discussion regarding the feasibility of commercial development in Loma Linda.

#### **PC-05-04 - APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MINUTES OF JULY 21, 2004 & AUGUST 4, 2004**

**Motion by Umeda, seconded by Sakala, and carried by a vote of 4-0  
Commissioner Christianson having left the meeting earlier during the  
discussion, to approve the minutes of July 21, 2004 and August 4, 2004.**

### **REPORTS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS**

Commissioner Umeda suggested that the Commission ask the City Council to authorize the hiring of a qualified consultant to prepare design guidelines.

Director Woldruff stated that staff would update the Development Code, which addressed design guidelines but if the City Council were in favor of having a consultant update the Zoning Code, one could possibly be hired.

### **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT**

Director Woldruff informed the Commission that the City Council was requesting a joint City Council Planning Commission meeting to set goals for development in Loma Linda, apart from any specific project. She added that it would be scheduled either in March or April and that she would keep the Commission informed.

She also reported that the project for the California Heart and Surgical Hospital planned for the corner of Barton Road and was scheduled for City Council on January 25, 2005.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:05 p.m.

Minutes approved at the meeting of June 1, 2005.

---

Administrative Secretary

*I:\PlanningCom (PC)\PC 2005\01-12-05M-app.doc*